

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

SUBMITTED TO RPC ON SEPTEMBER 17, 2009			
	Name / Date of Comment	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
1	Terry Hathaway 8-20-2009	Opposes RL20 designation of Hathaway Temescal Ranch (Parcel Numbers 3247-022-001, 3247-022-002, 3247-022-003, 3247-022-004, 3247-022 007, 3247-022-006 3247-022-005 3247-023-005, 3247-023-004, 3247-023-003, 3247-023-002, 3247-023-001, 3247-023-007, and 3247-023-006)	<p>The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • A portion of the property contains a significant ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • Almost all of the property is located in a proposed SEA; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A large portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • The property does not contain, and is distant from, existing and proposed routes on the Highway Plan; • The property is not served by sewer or public water; and • The property is distant from fire stations, schools, and other services.
2	Luke Salzarulo 8-29-2009	Believes that the Draft Plan will not preserve the rural nature of the Val Verde community.	Policy LU-1.2.9 of the Draft Plan states that the rural character of Val Verde will be protected. Staff welcomes follow-up comments regarding specific concerns.
3	Matt Beneviste	Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Numbers	Staff recommends changing this designation to RL2,

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

	9-9-2009	3244-030-029, 3244-030-027, 2810-001-035, and 2810-001-040. Suggests RL2, which is consistent with approved Tract No. 51644 (Tesoro del Valle).	which would be consistent with approved Tract No. 51644 (Tesoro del Valle). It should be noted that the revised Tract No. 51644 does not propose any re-design of the previously approved lots in this area.
4	County Sanitation Districts 9-9-2009	Comments on Draft EIR.	Comments acknowledged and will be addressed in the Final EIR.
5	Eva Kornev 9-14-2009	Opposes P designation of Parcel Number 2853-008-008 because this parcel does not contain a public facility and is privately owned. Suggests H5 designation, which is consistent with adjoining parcels.	Staff has verified that this parcel does not contain a public facility and recommends changing this designation to H5.
6	Shane Ramey 9-14-2009	<p>a) Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3211-003-014.</p> <p>b) Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3214-039-026.</p> <p>c) Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3214-040-064.</p>	<p>a) The current designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL2 designation is appropriate, as the property is in a rural area and has relatively few constraints. The proposed zoning, A-2-2, is consistent with the RL2 designation. The current zoning, A-2-1, is not. The parcel is also located in the Agua Dulce Community Standards District (CSD), which requires a 2 acre minimum lot size.</p> <p>b) The current designation for this parcel is Non-Urban 1 (N1). Staff feels that the RL10 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this parcel include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of the parcel contain slopes over 25% and over 50%; • The parcel is adjacent to a proposed SEA; • The parcel is in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the parcel is in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the parcel is in a Liquefaction Zone;

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the parcel is in a Flood Zone. <p>The RL10 designation requires a 2 acre minimum lot size. Therefore, the proposed zoning, A-1-2 is consistent with the RL10 designation. The current zoning, A-2-1, is not. The parcel is also located in the Agua Dulce Community Standards District (CSD), which requires a 2 acre minimum lot size.</p> <p>c) The current land use designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL10 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this parcel include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the parcel is located in a proposed SEA; • The parcel is in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • The parcels does not contain, and is distant from, existing and proposed routes on the Highway Plan; • The parcel is not served by sewer or public water; and • The parcel is distant from fire stations, schools, and other services. <p>The RL10 designation requires a 2 acre minimum lot size. Therefore, the proposed zoning, A-1-2 is consistent with the RL10 designation. The current zoning, A-2-1, is not. The parcel is also located in the Agua Dulce Community Standards District (CSD), which requires a 2 acre minimum lot size.</p>
SUBMITTED TO RPC ON OCTOBER 1, 2009			
7	Charles Moore 10-1-2009	Opposes RL5 and RL10 designations of Tract No. 53822 (Tapia Canyon Ranch). Suggests	The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL5 and

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		H2 designation, which is consistent with adjoining area (Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C).	<p>RL10 designations are appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • A large portion of the property contains a significant ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • The property is not served by sewer or public water. <p>If Tract No. 53822 has been deemed complete, the application may proceed under the provisions of the currently adopted Plan. Staff will follow-up with the property owner prior to the next public hearing.</p>
8	Dan Holmquist 10-1-2009	Represents Property Owners Water System (POWS) in Forrest Park. Indicates that H18 and H30 designations in portions of Forrest Park would result in increased density that cannot be served by the POWS.	Staff has re-evaluated the H18 and H30 designations in this area, using the Draft Plan's suitability criteria, and recommends changing these designations to H5.
9	Marguerite Happy 9-29-2009	Opposes re-zoning of Parcel Number 2813-006-021 from A-1-1 to A-1-2.	The proposed designation for this parcel is RL2. The A-1-2 zone is consistent with the proposed designation, but the A-1-1 zone is not.
10	Allen Hubsch (Windsor Pacific) 9-30-2009	Requests that the designation of Parcel Numbers 2853-006-001, 2853-006-002, and 2853-006-003 be restored to the designation	Staff recommends that these parcels be restored to the designation given in the Preliminary Draft Plan.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		given in the Preliminary Draft Plan, released in 2008.	
11	Allen Hubsch (WP Cyn. Country Associates) 9-30-2009	Requests that the designation of Parcel Numbers 2854-004-017 and 2854-004-018 be restored to the designation given in the Preliminary Draft Plan, released in 2008.	Staff recommends that these parcels be restored to the designation given in the Preliminary Draft Plan.
12	Allen Hubsch (Hogan & Hartson) 9-30-2009	Supports child care policies in the Draft Plan.	Comment acknowledged.
13	Matt Benevise 9-30-2009	Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 3271-005-025 and portions of Parcel Numbers 3247-032-040 and 3247-032-010. Cites incompatibility with proposed Tract No. 060665 and adjoining designations. Suggests H2 designation.	<p>The current designations of these parcels are Hillside Management (HM), Floodplain/Floodway (W), and Non-Urban 2 (N2). Staff does not feel that it would appropriate to convert this area from rural to urban land uses, given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria.</p> <p>If Tract No. 060665 has been deemed complete, the application may proceed under the provisions of the currently adopted Plan. Staff will follow-up with the property owner prior to the next public hearing.</p>
14	Diann Peterson 9-30-2009	Opposes Draft Plan because she wants to remain in Castaic, not the City of Santa Clarita.	The Draft Plan does not propose annexation of Castaic to the City of Santa Clarita.
15	Donna Tetzlaff 9-30-2009	Opposes Draft Plan because she wants to remain in Castaic, not the City of Santa Clarita.	See #14 above.
16	Denise Jens 9-30-2009	Opposes H18 and H30 designations in portions of Forrest Park.	Staff has re-evaluated the H18 and H30 designations in this area, using the Draft Plan's suitability criteria, and recommends changing these designations to H5.
17	Chris Ball 9-28-2009	Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Numbers 3231-010-016, 3231-010-017, 3231-010-018, 3231-010-019, 3231-010-020, 3231-010-021, 3231-010-022, and 3231-010-023. Suggests urban designation.	The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the parcels contain slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • The parcels are located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the parcels is located in a Landslide Zone; and • A portion of one of the parcels is located in a Liquefaction Zone. <p>Staff does not feel that it would appropriate to convert this area from rural to urban land uses.</p>
18	Tesoro del Valle HOA 9-28-2009	Opposes addition of a Highway designation between Castaic and the Tesoro del Valle community.	<p>This request has been referred to the County's Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC). Prior to the next public hearing, the IEC will hold a meeting to evaluate this request and will make a recommendation.</p>
19	Elizabeth Lantzy 9-24-2009	Opposes RL5 designation in Hasley and Sloan Canyons.	<p>The primary current designation for this area is Hillside Management (HM), although some areas are designated Non-Urban 1 (N1). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this area include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the area contains slopes over 25%, with some slopes over 50%; • The area contains significant ridgelines, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • The area is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Portions of the area are located in a Landslide Zone; • Portions of the area are located in a Liquefaction Zone;

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of the area are located in a Flood Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, this area is not served by sewer or public water. <p>Areas designated RL2 to the south and east are relatively less constrained. Areas designed RL1 and RL2 to the west reflect the density of previously approved subdivisions.</p>
20	Bill Blomgren 9-23-2009	<p>a) Opposes CN designation of Parcel Number 2813-024-006 and 2813-024-014. Suggests IL designation.</p> <p>b) Opposes RL5 designation of a portion of Parcel Number 2813-024-007. Suggests IL designation.</p>	<p>a) Staff recommends that the designation be changed to IL.</p> <p>b) The current designations for this parcel are Hillside Management (HM) and Non-Urban 2 (N2). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this parcel include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the parcel contains slopes over 25% with some slopes over 50%; • The parcel is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Portions of the parcel are located in a Landslide Zone; • Portions of the parcel are located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the parcel is not served by sewer or public water. <p>Staff does not feel that it would appropriate to convert this area from rural to industrial land uses.</p>
21	Castaic Area Town Council 9-22-2009	<p>a) Opposes any changes to the Castaic Area Community Standards District (CSD).</p> <p>b) Supports addition of a Highway designation between Castaic and the Tesoro del Valle community</p>	<p>a) Staff does not propose any changes to the Castaic Area CSD at this time.</p> <p>b) This request has been referred to the County's Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC). Prior to the next public hearing, the IEC will hold a</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		c) Opposes RL10 designation in Charley and Tapia Canyons. Suggests RL2 designation. d) Opposes RL5 designation in Hasley and Sloan Canyons. Suggests RL2 designation.	meeting to evaluate this request and will make a recommendation.
22	Sherrie Stolarik 9-22-2009	Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.	<p>When the Tesoro del Valle project (Tract No. 51644) was approved, specific dwelling unit allocations were given to Phase A, Phase B, and Phase C. Phase A has been constructed, but Phases B and C have not. Phase A was constructed with fewer dwelling units than allocated. It has been determined that, under the provisions of the currently adopted Plan, these unconstructed dwelling units may be transferred to Phases B and C without a Plan Amendment. The proposed H2 designation acknowledges this determination.</p> <p>A revised Tract No. 51644 must be approved before the density transfer can occur. An application for revised Tract No. 51644 has been submitted to the Department of Regional Planning and has been deemed complete.</p>
23	Shahram Monasebian & Bill Blomgren 9-21-2009	Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Numbers 2813-024-007, 2853-003-013, and 2853-006-006 to -016. Cites incompatibility with proposed approved Tract No. 47574. Suggests RL1, IL, and IO designations.	<p>If the Draft Plan is adopted, approved Tract No. 47574 may proceed under the conditions and time limitations of the previous approval.</p> <p>The current designations for these parcels are Hillside Management (HM) and Non-Urban 2 (N2). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of these parcels contain slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%;

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parcels are located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Portions of these parcels are located in a Landslide Zone; • A large portion of these parcels are located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the parcel is not served by sewer or public water. <p>Staff does not feel that it would appropriate to convert this area from rural to industrial land uses.</p>
24	Kenneth Brenner 9-21-2009	Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3214-038-033.	<p>The current land use designation for this parcel is Non-Urban 1 (N1), but the current zoning designation is R-3, which is inconsistent. This parcel is part of "Sleepy Valley," a community that has been developed with single-family homes at low urban densities, although it is surrounded by rural lands. Therefore staff has proposed an H5 land use designation, with R-1 zoning, which is consistent. Staff feels that these changes are appropriate.</p>
25	James & Doris Hill 9-20-2009	Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3214-042-023.	<p>Staff has re-evaluated the proposed land use and zoning designations. Staff recommends a CN land use designation and C-3 zoning.</p>
26	Helen Gubrud 9-19-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-026-055 and 3247-026-056. Suggests RL2 designation. Cites adjoining RL1 and RL2 designations.</p> <p>b) Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.</p>	<p>a) The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM), Non-Urban 1 (N1) and Non-Urban 2 (N2). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • All of the property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone;

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A majority of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer. <p>b) This request has been referred to the County's Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC). Prior to the next public hearing, the IEC will hold a meeting to evaluate this request and will make a recommendation.</p>
27	Norman Sprankle 9-19-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Number 3247-026-055. Suggests RL2 designation. Cites adjoining RL1 and RL2 designations.</p> <p>b) Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.</p>	See #26 above.
28	Vernon Sprankle 9-18-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-026-055 and 3247-026-056. Suggests RL2 designation. Cites adjoining RL1 and RL2 designations.</p> <p>b) Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.</p>	See #26 above.
29	Erik Pfahler 9-16-2009	Requests that portions of approved Tract No. 46018 be re-designated to be consistent with proposed revisions to the Tract. Specifically, requests that 13.7 acres be re-designated from H5 to H9, 14 acres be re-designated from H18 to OS-C, and 1 acre be re-designated from H18 to H9.	Although the Draft Countywide General Plan has an H9 designation, the Draft Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan does not. Therefore, staff recommends that 13.7 acres be re-designated from H5 to H18, 14 acres be re-designated from H18 to OS-C, and 1 acre be re-designated from H18 to H5. Staff will follow-up with the property owner prior to the next public hearing.
30	Carolyn Seitz 9-17-2009	Requests that the boundary between the CN designation and RL1 designation on Parcel Number 3231-006-006 be shifted to the south,	Staff recommends approval of this request.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		as it splits the parcel in the middle. Also requests that, if designations are shifted, that zoning designations also be shifted to be consistent.	
31	Native American Heritage Commission 9-10-2009	Comments on Draft EIR.	Comments acknowledged and will be addressed in the Final EIR.
32	Linda Tarnoff 9-29-2009	Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.	See #22 above.
33	Ruthann Levison 9-28-2009	Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.	See #22 above.
SUBMITTED TO RPC ON OCTOBER 5, 2009			
34	Don Henry 10-2-2009	Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 3212-019-029. Cites incompatibility with existing zoning and surrounding uses. Suggests IL.	Staff recommends approval of this request. A portion of the parcel is currently zoned M-1. Adjacent parcels are also designated IL and zoned M-1.
35	Diana Larios 10-2-2009	Opposes allowance of commercial uses in RL2 designation.	<p>The Draft Plan does not allow unlimited commercial uses in the RL designation. The commercial uses must serve the local rural area and are only allowed in “activity areas” that meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 1 mile from any commercial land use designation; • No greater than 5 acres in size; and • No individual use with more than 10,000 square feet of floor area. <p>Although a Plan Amendment would not be required for commercial uses in “activity areas,” a zone change would be required. A zone change would require public hearings before the RPC and Board of Supervisors, which would allow adjacent residents and property owners to review the proposed</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>commercial use(s) and to provide comments.</p> <p>The intent of these provisions is to allow local-serving businesses in rural areas so that residents are not compelled to travel large distances to meet their daily needs. This could potentially reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled.</p>
36	Jason Vroom 10-2-2009	Opposes CM designation of Parcel Number 2826-003-015 Suggests that a portion be re-designated to IO, with the remainder remaining as CM. Provided map of suggested split designation.	Staff feels that it would inappropriate to split the designation of this property. Given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria, either the CM or IO designations could be appropriate. Staff will follow-up with the property owner prior to the next public hearing.
37	Joanna Ivey 10-2-2009	Opposes RL10 designation of Parcel Numbers 3210-017-041 to -047. Cites incompatibility with existing zoning.	<p>The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM), Floodway/Floodplain (W) and Non-Urban 1 (N1). Staff feels that the RL10 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property is located in an adopted SEA; • A large portion of the property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • The property abuts the Angeles National Forest; • A large portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • A large portion of the property is located in a FEMA Flood Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer or public water.
38	Mary Ivey	Opposes RL10 designation of Parcel Numbers	See #37 above.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

	10-2-2009	3210-017-041 to -047. Cites incompatibility with existing zoning.	
39	Linda & Roger Haring 10-1-2009	Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Numbers 2813-012-005 and Number 2813-012-006.	Staff has re-evaluated the RL2 designation, using the Draft Plan's suitability criteria, and recommends changing this designation to RL1.
40	Ralph Grunauer 10-1-2009	Opposes RL10 designation of Parcel Number 2813-017-002. Suggests RL2 designation, which is consistent with adjoining Parcel Number 2813-017-003.	The primary current designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM), although a portion is designated Non-Urban 2 (N2). Staff has re-evaluated the designation of this parcel, using the Draft Plan's suitability criteria, and agrees that both parcels have similar constraints. Therefore, staff recommends changing the designation to RL2.
41	Eugene Lombardi 10-4-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 3247-053-004. Suggests RL1 designation.</p> <p>b) Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-032-025 and 3247-032-026. Suggests an urban designation.</p> <p>c) Opposes minimum lot size requirements in RL1 and RL2 designations.</p> <p>d) Opposes elimination of current Plan's "quarter mile rule" in Draft Plan. The "quarter mile rule" allows for additional density for rural projects within a quarter mile of an urban land use designation.</p>	<p>a) An RL1 designation for this parcel would be inconsistent with the Castaic Area Community Standards District (CSD), which requires a 2 acre minimum lot size for new subdivisions in this area.</p> <p>b) An urban designation for this parcel would be inconsistent with the Castaic Area CSD, which requires a 2 acre minimum lot size for new subdivisions in this area.</p> <p>c) The currently adopted Plan does not restrict clustering in rural areas. However, the currently adopted Agua Dulce CSD, San Francisquito Canyon CSD, and portions of the Castaic Area CSD all restrict clustering in rural areas by imposing minimum lot size requirements (2 acres). These restrictions are based on community concerns that unlimited clustering in rural areas can change the community character, as smaller urban-style lots may be created in rural areas. Therefore, staff believes it is appropriate to expand clustering restrictions to all rural areas. In the proposed RL1 designation, clustering will be prohibited and a 1 acre</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>minimum lot size will be required. In the proposed RL2 designation, clustering will also be prohibited and a 2 acre minimum lot size will be required.</p> <p>d) Staff feels that the “quarter mile rule” is not compatible with the Draft Plan’s proposed land use legend.</p>
SUBMITTED TO RPC ON NOVEMBER 5, 2009			
42	Craig Cantrell 10-12-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL1 designation of Parcel Number 3231-014-024. Cites incompatibility with current land use designation. Suggests an urban designation.</p> <p>b) Concerned about H18 designation of Parcel Numbers 3231-016-015 and 3231-016-018.</p> <p>c) Opposes removal of Highway designation between Forrest Park and Plum Canyon Road.</p>	<p>a) The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM) and Urban 2 (U2). Staff feels that the RL1 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan’s suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • All of the property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A large portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; and • To staff’s knowledge, the property is not served by sewer. <p>b) See #16 above.</p> <p>c) The Draft Plan will remove this designation. This change has been recommended by the Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC).</p>
43	Terance Chapman Undated	Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Numbers 3210-013-041	<p>The current designation for this parcel is Floodway/Floodplain (W) and Transportation Corridor (TC). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan’s suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25%; • All of the property is located in a proposed SEA; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • All of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and <p>The property is not served by sewer or public water.</p>
		3210-007-018	<p>The current designation for this parcel is Floodway/Floodplain (W). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25%; • All of the property is located in an adopted SEA; • All of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • A large portion of the property is in a FEMA flood zone; and • The property is not served by sewer or public water.
		3212-009-077	<p>The current designation for this parcel is Non-Urban 1 (N1). Staff feels that the RL2 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; and • The property is not served by sewer or public water.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

	3210-007-017	<p>The current designation for this parcel is Floodway/Floodplain (W). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the property contains slopes over 25%; • All of the property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Most of the property is located in a proposed SEA; • Most of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • The property abuts the Angeles National Forest; and • The property is not served by sewer or public water.
	3210-007-024	<p>The current designation for this parcel is Open Space-National Forest (O-NF). Staff feels that the OS-NF designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The entire property is located within the Angeles National Forest; • Almost all of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • All of the property is located in a proposed SEA; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone;

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • The property is not served by sewer or public water.
44	Ralph Grunauer 10-5-2009	Opposes RL10 designation of Parcel Number 2813-017-002. Suggests RL2 designation, which is consistent with adjoining Parcel Number 2813-017-003.	See #40 above.
45	Virginia Wolf 10-5-2009	a) Opposes allowance of commercial uses in RL2 designation. b) Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	a) See #35 above. b) This request has been referred to the County's Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC). Prior to the next public hearing, the IEC will hold a meeting to evaluate this request and will make a recommendation.
46	Karl Reinecker 2-17-2009 and 4-28-2009	a) Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Numbers 2865-006-004, 2865-006-016, and 2865-006-017. b) Believes that land use and zoning changes are unconstitutional. c) Concerned about notification to property owners. d) Believes that the theory of man-made climate change is based on flawed science. Disagrees with AB32 and SB375, State laws intended to address man-made climate change.	a) The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of the parcels contain slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • A large portion of the parcels are located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of one of the parcels is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the parcels are not served by sewer or public water. b) County Counsel has reviewed the proposed land use and zoning changes. To date, they have not identified any constitutional issues.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>c) In September 2009, mailed notice was sent to all property owners. Each notice was customized with the land use and zoning changes (if any) proposed for each parcel.</p> <p>d) The County is required to comply with all State laws, including AB32 and SB375.</p>
47	Cheryl & Jack Hawkins 10-5-2009	Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.	See #22 above.
48	Sherrie Stolarik 10-5-2009	<p>a) Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.</p> <p>b) Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.</p>	<p>a) See #22 above.</p> <p>b) This request has been referred to the County's Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC). Prior to the next public hearing, the IEC will hold a meeting to evaluate this request and will make a recommendation.</p>
49	Sherrie Stolarik 9-22-2009	<p>a) Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.</p> <p>b) Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.</p>	See #48 above.
50	Judy Reinsma 10-5-2009	Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.	See #22 above.
51	Castaic Lake Water Agency 10-28-2009	Comments on Draft EIR. Requests that the Water Section of the Draft EIR be updated with information from the State Department of Water Resource's 2010 State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report.	Comments acknowledged. The Water Section of the Draft EIR will be updated with information from the State Department of Water Resource's 2010 State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report and will be re-circulated for further review and comment. Additional comments will be addressed in the Final EIR.
52	Shadiq Ghias 10-30-2009	Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Numbers 3209-010-026, 3209-010-030, and 3209-010-031. Concerned that Conditional Use Permit for campground cannot	The primary current designation for these parcels is Floodway/Floodplain (W), although portions are designated Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		be renewed if Draft Plan is adopted.	<p>Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of the parcels contain slopes over 25% and 50%; • A large portion of the parcels are located in a proposed SEA; • The parcels are located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the parcels are located in a Landslide Zone; • A large portion of the parcels are located in a Liquefaction Zone; • A large portion of the parcels are located in a Flood Zone; • The parcels are not served by sewer or public water; and • The parcels are distant from fire stations, schools, and other services. <p>The proposed zoning for these parcels is A-2-2. Campgrounds are permitted by right in the A-2 Zone, and RV trailer parks are permitted in the A-2 Zone with a Conditional Use Permit. Therefore, the existing Conditional Use Permit could be renewed, pursuant to Zoning Ordinance requirements and the public hearing process.</p>
53	Roy Ramey 10-30-2009	Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3211-003-014.	See #6 above.
54	John Cahill 11-4-2009	a) Opposes IL designation and M-1 zoning of Parcel Number 2853-002-010. Cites incompatibility with existing structures. Indicates that 10 structures are on the property, and that they are used exclusively for	<p>a)</p> <p>a) If the existing structures were legally constructed, they may remain subject to the Non-Conforming Structure and Use provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. However, Assessor's records indicate</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		<p>religious purposes.</p> <p>b) Concerned that commercial uses are not allowed in IL designation and M-1 zone.</p> <p>c) Concerned that CN designation of Parcel Number 3214-025-028 will impact existing church use.</p> <p>d) Concerned that the Draft Plan contains flood plain maps that differ from Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood plain maps.</p> <p>e) Concerned that Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designations limit a parcel to 1 dwelling unit, and that a Conditional Use Permit is required for that dwelling unit.</p>	<p>only one structure (single-family home) on the premises. A single-family home is exempt from the termination provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.</p> <p>b) The description of the IL designation in the Draft Plan states that “Allowable uses in this designation include . . . supportive commercial uses.” The Zoning Ordinance allows commercial uses in the M-1 zone.</p> <p>c) Churches are allowed in the proposed CN designation. The zoning will remain C-3, which allows churches as a by-right use.</p> <p>d) The Draft Plan’s flood plain map (Exhibit S-4) is derived from FEMA data, so staff is not aware of any inconsistencies. Staff welcomes follow-up comments regarding specific concerns.</p> <p>e) The SEA designation does not limit a parcel to 1 dwelling unit, as the maximum density is determined by the land use designation (e.g. RL1, RL2, RL5, etc.). Section 22.56.215 of the Zoning Ordinance exempts one dwelling unit on one parcel of land from the SEA Conditional Use Permit requirement, and staff does not proposed any amendment to the Section at this time.</p>
55	Henry Ulrick 10-29-2009	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	This request has been referred to the County’s Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC). Prior to the next public hearing, the IEC will hold a meeting to evaluate this request and will make a recommendation.
56	Allen Russell 9-25-2009	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #55 above.
57	Boone Narr 10-26-2009	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #55 above.
58	Karen Allard	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road	See #55 above.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

	10-29-2009	(north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	
59	Dorothy Jesser 9-27-2009	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #55 above.
60	Vernon Sprankle 10-5-2009	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #55 above.
61	Jon Hockenberry 10-5-2009	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #55 above.
62	Eugene Lombardi 10-8-2009	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #55 above.
63	Castaic Area Town Council 10-22-2009	Requests clarification on the relationship between the Castaic Area Community Standards District (CSD) and the Draft Plan.	Staff provided a response on 10-29-2009. This response was also submitted to the RPC on 11-5- 2009.
64	Roy Ramey 10-29-2009 (3 letters)	a) Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3211-003-014. b) Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3214-039-026. c) Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3214-040-064.	See #6 above.
65	State Clearinghouse 11-3-2009	Comments on Draft EIR.	Comments acknowledged and will be addressed in the Final EIR.
66	State Department of Fish and Game 11-5-2009	Comments on Draft EIR.	Comments acknowledged and will be addressed in the Final EIR.
SUBMITTED TO RPC ON NOVEMBER 19, 2009			
67	Matt Benevise 11-5-2009	Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 2865-012-001. Suggests H2 designation.	The current designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM) and Urban 3 (U3). Staff feels that the RL2 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this parcel include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%;

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The property contains a significant ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Most of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and <p>To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer.</p>
		Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 2865-019-010; Suggests H2 designation.	<p>The current designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM) and Urban 2 (U2). Staff feels that the RL2 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this parcel include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • The property contains a significant ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Most of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer.
		Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 2865-019-009; Suggests H2 designation.	<p>The current designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM) and Urban 2 (U2). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>for this parcel include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • A portion of the property contains a significant ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • Almost all of the property is located in a proposed SEA; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A large portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer.
68	<p>Castaic Area Town Council 11-11-2009</p>	<p>a) Concerned about impact of Draft Plan on approved projects. b) Concerned about impact of Draft Plan on pending projects. c) Opposes restrictions on clustering (density-controlled development) in all RL designations. d) Opposes any changes to the Castaic Area Community Standards District (CSD). e) Requests that the Castaic Area CSD be considered as a local plan.</p>	<p>Staff provided a response on 1-13-2010.</p> <p>a) Projects that have been previously approved by the RPC or Board of Supervisors are not affected by the Draft Plan. If the Draft Plan is adopted, these projects may proceed under the conditions and time limitations of the previous approval.</p> <p>b) Pending project applications are not affected by the Draft Plan if they are filed with the Department of Regional Planning and deemed complete prior to adoption of the Draft Plan. These applications may proceed under the provisions of the currently adopted Plan. The Draft Plan will be revised to clarify these provisions prior to the next public hearing.</p> <p>cc) The currently adopted Plan does not restrict clustering in rural areas. However, the currently adopted Agua Dulce CSD, San Francisquito Canyon CSD, and portions of the Castaic Area CSD all</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>restrict clustering in rural areas by imposing minimum lot size requirements (2 acres). These restrictions are based on community concerns that unlimited clustering in rural areas can change the community character, as smaller urban-style lots may be created in rural areas. Therefore, staff believes it is appropriate to expand clustering restrictions to all rural areas. In the proposed RL1 designation, clustering will be prohibited and a 1 acre minimum lot size will be required. In the proposed RL2 designation, clustering will also be prohibited and a 2 acre minimum lot size will be required. In the proposed RL5, RL10, RL20 designations, clustering will be allowed, but a 2 acre minimum lot size will be required.</p> <p>d) Staff does not propose any changes to the Castaic Area CSD at this time.</p> <p>de) The CSD is a component of the Zoning Ordinance, not the General Plan, so it cannot be considered as a local plan. The local plan is the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.</p>
69	Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy 11-16-2009	<p>a) Believes that the new Significant Ecological Area (SEA) boundaries are not determined and cannot be used until adopted as part of the Countywide General Plan.</p> <p>b) Comments on Draft EIR</p> <p>c) Suggests that all RL2 and RL5 designations be re-designated to RL10</p> <p>d) Suggests that the North Lake Specific Plan be eliminated.</p>	<p>a) The new SEA boundaries are provided in Exhibit CO-5. The new SEA boundaries will be adopted when the Draft Plan is adopted. The Draft Plan is a component of the Countywide General Plan.</p> <p>b) Comments acknowledged and will be addressed in the Final EIR.</p> <p>c) All rural areas were evaluated pursuant to the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Parcels that have been designated RL2 and RL5 were found to be more suitable (with relatively fewer constraints) than parcels that have been designated RL10 and RL20.</p> <p>d) The Draft Plan does not propose any changes to</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			adopted Specific Plans.
70	Maureen Davidheiser 11-16-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL20 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>b) Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>c) Opposes conservation easement requirements.</p>	<p>a) The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • A portion of the property contains a significant ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; Almost all of the property is located in a • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Most of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • The property does not contain, and is distant from, existing and proposed routes on the Highway Plan; • The property is not served by sewer or designation prior to the next public water; • The property is distant from fire stations, schools, and other services. <p>b) Staff will re-evaluate the proposed SEA;</p> <p>c) The Draft Plan does not include policies that require conservation easements. Currently adopted Zoning Ordinance regulations for hillside management areas and Significant Ecological Areas (Section 22.56.215) have open space standards, but do not require conservation easements. Staff does not propose any amendments to these Zoning</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			Ordinance regulations at this time.
71	Agua Dulce Town Council 11-17-2009	Opposes re-zoning of several parcels in Agua Dulce from R-R to A-1 or A-2.	Staff feels that the R-R zone is incompatible with Rural Land designations. It allows several potentially impactful resort and recreational uses by-right, but requires a Conditional Use Permit for a single family home. The A-1 and A-2 zones are more appropriate, as they allow a single family home by-right and require a Conditional Use Permit for potentially impactful uses.
72	Nicole Pyburn Valenzuela 11-17-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL20 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>b) Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>c) Believes that land use and zoning changes, as well as proposed SEA designations, are unconstitutional.</p> <p>d) Opposes conservation easement requirements.</p> <p>e) Believes that the City of Santa Clarita has had undue influence in the development of the Draft Plan.</p> <p>f) Believes that the proposed land use designations are intended to facilitate open space acquisition.</p>	<p>a) See #70a above.</p> <p>b) See #70b above.</p> <p>c) County Counsel has reviewed the proposed land use and zoning changes and the proposed SEA designations. To date, they have not identified any constitutional issues.</p> <p>d) See #70c above.</p> <p>e) Although the Draft Plan is the result of a collaborative effort between the County and the City of Santa Clarita, it represents the independent analysis and judgment of County staff.</p> <p>f) The intent of the Draft Plan is not to facilitate open space acquisition. As stated in the Introduction, the intent is to guide the regulation of development, in compliance with State Law requirements.</p>
73	Carl Tarquinio 11-18-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL1 designation of Parcel Number 3231-007-042.</p> <p>b) Requests "buffer zone" between his property, Parcel Number 3231-007-042, and adjacent CN designation.</p>	a) The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL1 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A large portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and <p>To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer.</p> <p>b) Staff recommends that the proposed CN designation of adjacent Parcel Number 3231-007-041 be adjusted to match the current C-3 zoning boundary, which should provide the "buffer" that is being requested.</p>
74	Tarran Chew 11-18-2009	Opposes re-zoning of Parcel Number 3212-011-074 from R-R to A-1.	See #71 above.
75	Shannon & Judy Pickett 11-18-2009	Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of Parcel Number 3214-022-026.	Staff will re-evaluate the proposed SEA designation prior to the next public hearing.
76	Bill Davidheiser 11-19-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL20 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>b) Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p>	<p>a) See #70a above.</p> <p>b) See #70b above.</p>
77	Linda Pyburn 11-19-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL20 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>b) Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p>	<p>a) See #70a above.</p> <p>b) See #70b above.</p> <p>c) See #72c above.</p> <p>d) See #70c above.</p> <p>e) These parcels are included in the currently adopted Area Plan, so they will continue to be included in the Draft Plan.</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		<p>c) Believes that land use and zoning changes, as well as proposed SEA designations, are unconstitutional.</p> <p>d) Opposes conservation easement requirements.</p> <p>e) Requests that Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020 be removed from the Draft Plan.</p>	
SUBMITTED TO RPC ON DECEMBER 3, 2009			
78	Nicole Pyburn Valenzuela 11-23-2009 (2 e-mails)	This is a written version of the testimony Ms. Valenzuela provided to the RPC on 11-23-2009. It reiterates the comments she provided on 11-17-2009 (see #72 above).	See #72 above.
79	Friends of the Santa Clara River 11-24-2009	<p>a) Comments on Draft EIR.</p> <p>b) Suggests that the Development Monitoring System (DMS) be retained.</p>	<p>a) Comments acknowledged and will be addressed in the Final EIR.</p> <p>b) The DMS is a component of the Countywide General Plan. No amendments to the DMS are proposed at this time and it will remain in effect until such time that the Countywide General Plan is amended.</p>
80	Santa Clarita Valley Facilities Foundation 11-20-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL2 designation of Parcels 3231-001-011, 3231-001-015, 3231-001-018, 3231-001-019, 3231-004-014, and 3231-004-015. Cites inconsistency with proposed subdivision (32 residential lots with average 1 acre lot size, 1 school lot, and 1 proposed commercial lot).</p> <p>b) Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Numbers 2813-018-002, 2813-018-003, 2813-018-004, and 2813-018-009, 2853-002-001, and 2853-002-007. Cites inconsistency with proposed subdivision (102 residential lots with average 0.5 acre lot size), existing commercial</p>	Staff will follow-up with the property owner prior to the next hearing.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		zoning, and approved Tract No. 47573. c) Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 3247-043-011. Cites inconsistency with pending Tract No. 52475.	
81	William S. Hart Union High School District 11-20-2009	Supports requests of Santa Clarita Valley Facilities Foundation (see #80 above).	See #80 above.
82	Linda & Larry Stelling 12-1-2009	Supports re-zoning of several parcels in Agua Dulce from R-R to A-1 or A-2. This is a response to the Agua Dulce Town Council's opposition (see #71 above).	Comment acknowledged.
83	State Department of Transportation 12-1-2009	Comments on Draft EIR.	Comments acknowledged and will be addressed in the Final EIR.
84	National Resources Defense Council 11-30-2009	Comments on Draft EIR. Requests that Sections of the Draft EIR be revised and re-circulated.	Comments acknowledged. The relevant sections of the Draft EIR will be revised and will be re-circulated for further review and comment. Additional comments will be addressed in the Final EIR.
85	State Department of Justice (Attorney General) 12-1-2009	a) Believes that Draft Plan will not meet the mandates of AB32. b) Comments on Draft EIR. Requests that Sections of the Draft EIR be revised and re-circulated.	a) Comment acknowledged. Prior to the next public hearing, staff from the County and City of Santa Clarita will jointly review the policies in the Draft Plan, using the model policies developed by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) as a guide, and will make appropriate revisions to ensure consistency with the mandates of AB32. b) Comments acknowledged. The relevant sections of the Draft EIR will be revised and will be re-circulated for further review and comment. Additional comments will be addressed in the Final EIR.
SUBMITTED TO RPC ON FEBRUARY 11, 2010			

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

86	Shannon Pickett 11-18-2009	Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of Parcel Number 3214-039-032.	Staff will re-evaluate the proposed SEA designation prior to the next public hearing.
87	William & Edda Elmore 11-19-2009	Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of Parcel Number 3214-040-046.	Staff will re-evaluate the proposed SEA designation prior to the next public hearing.
88	Southern California Edison 12-18-2009	Suggests that staff review a comment letter regarding the Draft Countywide General Plan (dated 11-20-2008), as those comments apply to some of the policies in the Draft Plan.	Comments acknowledged. Prior to the next public hearing, staff will review the policies in the Draft Plan and may make appropriate revisions pursuant to these comments.
89	Craig Cantrell 12-28-2009	Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Number 3231-014-024. Suggests H5 designation.	<p>The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • A portion of the property contains a significant ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • Almost all of the property is located in a proposed SEA; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A large portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • The property does not contain, and is distant from, existing and proposed routes on the Highway Plan; • The property is not served by sewer or public water; and <p>The property is distant from fire stations, schools,</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			and other services.
90	David Brandon 1-22-2010	Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3214-020-046.	The current designation for this parcel is Non-Urban 1 (N1) and the proposed designation is RL2. Both designations allow the same density (1 unit per 2 acres). The primary current zoning designation is A-1-20000, although a very small portion is zoned C-3. The proposed zoning designation is A-1-2, which is consistent with both the current and proposed land use designations. The existing C-3 zoning is inconsistent with both the current and proposed land use designations.
91	Castaic Area Town Council 1-25-2010	Opposes restrictions on clustering (density-controlled development) in all RL designations.	See #68c above.
92	State Department of Justice (Attorney General) 1-26-2010	Acknowledges phone conversation with staff in which staff indicated that the Draft EIR will be revised and will be re-circulated for further review and comment.	Comment acknowledged.
93	Robert Tallent 1-29-2010	<p>a) Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-013 and 3247-028-016.</p> <p>b) Believes that land use and zoning changes are unconstitutional.</p>	<p>a) The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of these parcels contains slopes over 25%, and a large portion contains slopes over 50%; • The parcels are located in a proposed SEA; • The parcels are located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the parcels is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the parcels is located in a Liquefaction Zone;

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parcels do not contain, and are distant from, existing and proposed routes on the Highway Plan; • The parcels are not served by sewer or public water; and • The parcels are distant from fire stations, schools, and other services. <p>b) County Counsel has reviewed the proposed land use and zoning changes and the proposed SEA designations. To date, they have not identified any constitutional issues.</p>
94	Nicole Pyburn Valenzuela 2-1-2010	<p>Generally reiterates the comments she provided on 11-17-2009 (see #72 above). However, new comments include:</p> <p>a) Comments on Draft EIR.</p> <p>b) Opposes restrictions on clustering (density-controlled development) in all RL designations.</p> <p>c) Concerned about Policies CO-3.6.3, CO-3.1.7, and CO-3.1.5, as they restrict uses in Significant Ecological Areas.</p>	<p>See #72 above for response to reiterated comments.</p> <p>a) Comments acknowledged and will be addressed in the Final EIR.</p> <p>b) See #68c above.</p> <p>c) Policy CO-3.6.3 is not intended to restrict someone from using an off-road vehicle on their own property. Policy CO-3.1.7 applies to all areas, not just SEA areas, and is consistent with adopted Zoning Ordinance requirements for drought-tolerant landscaping. Policy CO-3.1.5 applies to all areas, not just SEA areas, and is consistent with adopted Zoning Ordinance requirements for drought-tolerant landscaping.</p>
95	Maureen Davidheiser 1-30-2010	Reiterates comments she provided on 11-16-2009 (see #70 above).	See #70 above.
96	Francine Hathaway Rippy 1-30-2010	a) Opposes RL20 designation of Hathaway Temescal Ranch (Parcel Numbers 3247-022-001, 3247-022-002, 3247-022-003, 3247-022-004, 3247-022 007, 3247-022-006 3247-022-005 3247-023-005, 3247-023-004, 3247-023-003, 3247-023-002, 3247-023-001, 3247-023-	<p>a) See #1 above.</p> <p>b) Staff will re-evaluate the proposed SEA designation prior to the next public hearing.</p> <p>c) See #72 and #94 above.</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		<p>007, and 3247-023-006).</p> <p>b) Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of majority of Hathaway Temescal Ranch (Parcel Numbers 3247-022-001, 3247-022-002, 3247-022-003, 3247-022-004, 3247-022 007, 3247-022-006 3247-022-005 3247-023-005, 3247-023-004, 3247-023-003, 3247-023-002, 3247-023-001, 3247-023-007, and 3247-023-006).</p> <p>c) Agrees with comments made by Nicole Pyburn (see #72 and #94 above).</p>	
97	Sierra Club 2-1-2010	<p>a) Opposes elimination of the Development Monitoring System (DMS).</p> <p>b) Comments on Draft EIR.</p>	<p>a) The DMS is a component of the Countywide General Plan. No amendments to the DMS are proposed at this time and it will remain in effect until such time that the Countywide General Plan is amended.</p> <p>b) Comments acknowledged and will be addressed in the Final EIR.</p>
98	Golden Oak Ranch 2-1-2010	<p>a) Comments on Draft EIR.</p> <p>b) Opposes 60 foot height limit in IO designation, references Page 3.1-22 of the Draft EIR.</p> <p>c) Notes inconsistency between Significant Ecological Areas (SEA) map in the Draft Plan and the corresponding map in the Draft EIR.</p> <p>d) Requests that the proposed Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation on the property exclude areas allowed for set construction under the property's current Conditional Use Permit.</p> <p>e) Concerned about Figure 3.16-2 (Trails Map) in the Draft EIR, as there are not dedicated public trails located on the property.</p>	<p>a) Comments acknowledged and will be addressed in the Final EIR.</p> <p>b) The 60 foot height limit was included in the Preliminary Draft Plan, but was removed from the Draft Plan. The Draft EIR will be revised for consistency.</p> <p>c) The SEA map in the Draft Plan is correct. The Draft EIR will be revised for consistency.</p> <p>d) Staff will re-evaluate the proposed SEA designation prior to the next public hearing and will follow-up with the property owner.</p> <p>e) Figure 3.16-2, as well as Exhibit CO-9 of the Draft Plan, is intended to show the Master Plan of Trails, not trails that are currently dedicated and available for public use. Staff will follow-up with Golden Oak</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			Ranch to clarify this issue prior to the next public hearing.
99	County of Ventura 12-2-2009 (received 2-1-2010)	Comments on Draft EIR.	Comments acknowledged and will be addressed in the Final EIR.